

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. By this communication, claims 6-8 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to the underlying subject matter. Claims 1, 5, 9, 10, 13, and 15 are amended and claims 16-19 are added. Support for the newly added and amended subject matter can be found, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the disclosure. Claims 1-5, 9-13, and 15-19 are pending.

Objection to the Specification

The Specification was objected to for an alleged clerical error in the Abstract. Applicant has amended the Abstract to address this concern. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Acknowledgement of Priority Claim

On February 8, 2002, upon filing this application, Applicant made a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119. A certified copy of application 01100950.7 is submitted with this response.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, claim 13 has been amended to address these concerns. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by *Chasen et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,721). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The *Chasen* patent fails to anticipate Applicant's claims because it does not teach every element recited therein. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to recite, among other features, displaying in a second window displayed on a visual display unit of a data processing apparatus, at least one word chosen from a plurality of words shown in a first window of said data processing apparatus, wherein the at least one first word is displayed in the second window in a descriptor that includes at least one second word located in at least one immediately proceeding level in the word hierarchy.

In contrast, the *Chasen* patent discloses a system and method for reading metadata from a metadata database and dramatically displaying the metadata in an organized manner such as a hierarchical tree, and a graphical user interface. As shown in Figure 1, the *Chasen* patent displayed at least two windows 120 and 130. However, neither of the displayed windows includes at least one first word displayed in a second window in a descriptor that includes at least one second word located in at least one immediately preceding level in the word hierarchy. For example, the selected term "Classical" of the window 120 is not displayed in a descriptor in the second window 130.

Applicant reminds the Office that to properly anticipate a claim, the document must disclose, explicitly or implicitly, each and every feature recited in the claim. See Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 13 and their

corresponding dependent claims are not anticipated. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Chasen et al*). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted above, claim 14 is cancelled without prejudice. This rejection is thereby rendered moot with respect to this claim. Because claim 15 depends from independent claim 13, and claim 13 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed in detail above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is likewise allowable by virtue of its dependency. Furthermore, Applicant believes that claim 15 is distinguishable over the *Chasen* patent by the additional features recited therein. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested.

Newly Added Claims

Newly added claims 16-19 are allowable over the applied art of record because they directly or indirectly recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. Favorable consideration and allowance of these claims are therefore respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

In numbered paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO alleges that Applicant's previously filed Information Disclosure Statement on February 8, 2002 is deficient because legible copies of each cited foreign patent document were omitted. Applicant disagrees, however, because PAIR lists and provides clear and legible images for the aforementioned foreign patent documents. It is unclear whether the

PTO suggests that a complete copy of each document be provided. For convenience, Applicant has submitted herewith complete copies of each document and a copy of the original Form 1449. Applicant requests, therefore, that the previously filed IDS be considered and verified by initialing the Form 1449.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-5, 9-13, and 15-19 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a favorable examination and consideration of the instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in even better form, Applicant requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: November 30, 2007

By:


Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620